

### **REMARKS**

These remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed May 25, 2010 ("Action"). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

#### **Substance of Interview**

Applicants provide the following substance of the interview in accordance with M.P.E.P. 713.04. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Schnurr for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on August 3, 2010. In the interview, Applicants discussed the claim 1 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Begeja et al. (US 2003/0030752), Logan et al. (US 2003/0093790), and Shimomura et al. (US 6,526,580). Examiner Schnurr recommended clarifying claim 1 to recite that a video clip is selected, rather than specified, for presentation at a node in a decision tree. Subsequently, Applicants proposed the above amendment to claim 1 and Examiner Schnurr indicated that the amendment appears to overcome the cited references.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 6-13, 15-17, 22-29, 31-33, 38-45, and 47-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Begeja et al. (US 2003/0030752) in view of Logan et al. (US 2003/0093790) and further in view of Shimomura et al. (US 6,526,580).

Claims 14, 30, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Begeja in view of Logan in view of Shimomura and further in view of Mitchell (US 2002/01621120).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 is drawn to a method comprising:

“ providing one or more lists, each list containing a plurality of video clips;  
receiving input selecting a set of two or more of the plurality of video clips for presentation and a sequencing order, wherein the sequencing order is specified by a user-specified traversal of a decision tree having a plurality of decision nodes structured such that selecting a video clip at a first node constrains selection of video clips at a subsequent node;

creating, by a processor prior to presentation, a composite video clip sequence comprising the set of the two or more of the plurality of video clips in

the sequencing order, wherein each of the video clips is a component video clip of the composite video clip sequence; and  
causing presentation of the composite video clip sequence.”

Claim 1 has been amended as discussed during the examiner interview, and hence the combination of Begeja, Logan, and Shimomura does not disclose at least creating, prior to presentation, a composite video clip sequence comprising a set of two or more video clips in a sequencing order specified by a user-specified traversal of a decision tree having a plurality of decision nodes structured such that selecting a video clip at a first node constrains selection of video clips at a subsequent node. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 defines over the cited references and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claims 17, 33, and 48, are allowable at least for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 1. The pending dependent claims are allowable at least due to dependence on an allowable claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: August 25, 2010

By: Christopher M. Swickhamer/  
Christopher M. Swickhamer  
Registration No. 59,853  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive,  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001